
Article

The Influence of Incentives, Organizational Culture, and Work Environment on Student Work Productivity (Case Study of Pertamina University Internship Students Class of 2021)

Ayu Sasmita¹, Evi Sofia^{1*}

¹Faculty of Economics & Business, Pertamina University Jl. Teuku Nyak Arief, Simprug, Kebayoran Lama, South Jakarta 12220

email: ayusasmita17.20@gmail.com

*Correspondence email: evi.sofia@universitaspertamina.ac.id

Abstract: This study aims to analyze the influence of incentives, organizational culture, and work environment on the work productivity of students carrying out internships at Pertamina University, especially the 2021 batch. This research approach is quantitative with a causal-comparative method. The researcher distributed questionnaires to 90 respondents using a simple random sampling technique to collect data. The results of the study indicate that partial incentives do not have a significant effect on work productivity. In contrast, organizational culture and work environment partially affect work productivity considerably. In addition, incentives, organizational culture, and work environment considerably affect productivity. The conclusion of this study indicates that companies or institutions providing internships need to increase the provision of incentives, create a supportive organizational culture, and provide a conducive work environment to encourage student work productivity. For students, this study can provide insight into the factors that influence their work productivity while undergoing an internship program.

Keywords: *Incentives, Organizational Culture, Work Environment, Work Productivity.*

Reference to this paper should be written as follows: Sasmita, A., & Sofia, E. (2024). The Influence of Incentives, Organizational Culture, and Work Environment on Student Work Productivity (Case Study of Pertamina University Internship Students Class of 2021), *Journal of Management and Energy Business*, 4(2), 16-30.

1. Introduction

Growing globalization has brought significant changes to the world of work, creating opportunities and challenges for nations to achieve greatness. One indicator of a country's success in facing this era is how advanced the nation is in media, information, and technology. As part of the global community, Indonesia is also affected, with companies

*Corresponding author.

Copyright © 2025 Journal of Management and Energy Business

This work is licensed under a Creative Attribution-Non Commercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

<https://doi.org/10.54595/jmeh.v4i2.79>

needing to adapt to stay competitive. This shift demands that companies become more selective in choosing employees who can innovate and adjust to the challenges of a globalized world.

The unemployment rate in Indonesia is still a significant problem, especially among the younger generation. Based on the report of the Central Statistics Agency (2024), the Open Unemployment Rate (TPT) in February 2024 reached 4.82%, a decrease of 0.63% compared to February 2023. Despite the decline, the unemployment rate remains high, at 7.20 million people. The 15-24 age group has been the highest contributor to unemployment in the last three years, with a percentage of 16.42% in February 2024 [1].

The high unemployment rate in the 15-24 age range shows a gap between education and work. Vocational High School (SMK) graduates have the highest unemployment rate compared to graduates of other levels of education, which is 8.62% in 2024. According to Tarma [2], SMK graduates with a high unemployment rate are due to differences in the quality of SMK graduates and what is needed by the industry. Therefore, an evaluation of the education curriculum must align with the demands of the world of work.

In addition to vocational school graduates, college graduates face job challenges. BPS data (2024) shows that the working population rate for Diploma I-III graduates is only 2.39%, while Diploma IV, S1, S2, and S3 graduates reach 10.28%. Tilaar [3] stated that three main factors cause low absorption of college graduates in the workforce, namely cultural barriers related to work ethic, incompatibility of the curriculum with industry needs, and low quality of human resources that are unable to meet the needs of the labor market.

To answer these challenges, universities have begun implementing work practice or internship programs to improve students' work readiness. The results of research by Sofia, Yuliati, Hartoyo, and Soehadi [4] show that respondents chose Pertamina University because of the internship opportunities offered. Pertamina University makes work practice a compulsory course for thirteen study programs and an elective for two other programs, with a weighting of two credits and a minimum duration of 150 hours. During the implementation, students must carry out tasks given by the agency or company with guidance from the agency's supervisor and the university's supervisor. This program aims for students to apply the theories they have learned during lectures to the industrial world.

However, implementing practical work does not always run optimally because various factors can affect student productivity during the internship. Work productivity can be measured by a person's effectiveness and efficiency in completing tasks [5]. Damastara and Sitohang [6] added that work productivity reflects the effective utilization of resources. According to Bashori [7], individual productivity is greatly influenced by the activities carried out during the learning process.

In an academic context, student productivity describes their effectiveness in managing time, energy, and resources to achieve educational and non-academic goals. Student work productivity during internship includes completing tasks effectively, adapting to the work environment, and applying theory to practice. In addition, employers measure productivity by evaluating the quality of work, the ability to collaborate, and the initiative taken in facing challenges. Therefore, student work productivity during internship is an

indicator of the success of this program in preparing students to enter the workforce, with various factors that can influence it.

Based on previous research, one factor that can increase work productivity is incentives. Akila [8] stated that incentives are a means to motivate employees to work better. In addition to incentives, organizational culture also plays a role in increasing work productivity. Sudanang and Priyanto [9] found that a good organizational culture positively and significantly influences work productivity at Horison Apartemen and Kondotel Yogyakarta. Thus, organizations must create a supportive culture to optimize employee productivity. Furthermore, research from Fau and Buulolo [10] stated that a comfortable work environment, both physically and non-physically, will increase employee satisfaction and performance.

Studying the influence of incentives, organizational culture, and work environment on student work productivity is expected to provide a clearer picture of the factors that can improve student work readiness and quality in a competitive world of work. Therefore, researchers are interested in conducting a study entitled "The Influence of Incentives, Organizational Culture, and Work Environment on Student Work Productivity: Case Study of Pertamina University Internship Students Class of 2021".

Based on the background above, the objectives of this study are as follows: 1) To analyze the effect of incentives on the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students, class of 2021; 2) To analyze the effect of organizational culture on the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students, class of 2021; 3) To analyze the effect of the work environment on the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students, class of 2021; 4) To analyze the effect of incentives, organizational culture, and work environment on the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students, class of 2021.

2. Literature

2.1 Incentive

Incentives are one way to motivate someone, and they can be given either financially or non-financially, such as by providing money, appreciation, recreational opportunities, or opportunities to develop a career [11]. Meanwhile, according to Hariandja [12], incentives are a form of direct payment based on performance, as a form of appreciation for increased productivity or cost savings. Usually, the higher the productivity or perseverance of employees, the greater the incentives received to grow work motivation. Mangkunegara [13] stated that incentives are a form of appreciation for the money organizational leaders give employees to motivate them to achieve organizational goals. Research by Lampa, Yantu, and Bokingo [14] shows that incentives significantly affect employee work productivity at PT. PLN (Persero) ULP. Telaga Gorontalo.

2.2 Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is a collection of norms and customs considered correct by all organization members and become guidelines for interacting and organizing [15]. According to Susanto [16], organizational culture is the values that guide human resources in facing external challenges and adapting within the company, so each member needs to understand these values and how to act and behave appropriately.

Meanwhile, according to Robbins and Coulter [17], organizational culture is a collection of shared values and principles used as guidelines, traditions maintained, and specific methods or ways applied in daily activities. Robbins [18] stated that organizational culture creates identity, increases commitment, and maintains social stability in the organization. Research conducted by Mulyani and Utami [19] shows that organizational culture significantly affects employee productivity at PT. Berkat Anugrah Sejahtera in Samarinda.

2.3 Work Environment

According to Badrianto [20], the work environment refers to all the factors surrounding employees that can impact their ability to perform their duties and responsibilities. These factors include elements such as the cleanliness of the work area, the atmosphere created by music, adequate lighting, and other facilities that contribute to the comfort and productivity of employees.

Furthermore, according to Simanjuntak [21], the work environment is all the equipment used, the atmosphere around the workplace, and the methods and methods used in working, which can influence performance, individually and in groups. Meanwhile, the opinion of Ghoniyah, Nunung, and Masuri [22] states that the work environment is a place and condition where someone carries out their duties, which influences the way they work and builds relationships between employees. Research conducted by Syahputra, Podungge, and Bokingo [23] shows that the work environment significantly affects employee work productivity at the Public Housing and Settlement Area Service of Gorontalo City.

2.4 Work Productivity

Work productivity compares the results obtained (output) in goods or services with the input used (input). Productivity is measured as work efficiency by measuring results based on the physical form or value of the output compared to labor or other inputs [24]. In another perspective, experts define work productivity as the output of goods or services, evaluated based on their quality and quantity, while considering the time and standards the company sets [25]. In line with the opinion of Fathussyaadah and Ardiansyah [26], work productivity is a person's ability to produce goods or services by utilizing various resources to improve the quality and quantity of work results in the company. Sutrisno [27] stated that in measuring work productivity, there must be indicators such as ability, increased results, work enthusiasm, self-development, and quality.

3. Methods

This study uses a quantitative approach with a comparative causal method. According to Sugiyono [28], quantitative research tests theories by measuring research variables in numbers and analyzing data with statistical procedures. Meanwhile, according to Damastara & Sitohang, the comparative causal method aims to see the causal relationship between two or more variables based on data collected after the event. This study aims to test the hypothesis regarding the effect of incentives, organizational culture, and work environment on the work productivity of student internship students.

The population in this study were all Pertamina University students, class of 2021. The researcher used simple random sampling to select the sample, a random selection method that does not consider differences in levels or strata within the population [29]. The researcher calculated the sample using the Slovin formula with an error rate of 10% and a confidence level of 90%, meaning that they estimated 90 out of 100 samples would represent the actual population. Where n is the number of samples, N is the number of populations, and e is the margin of error.

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} = \frac{947}{1+947(0.1)^2} = 90$$

The calculation results show that the sample required for the study was 90 students from the 2021 batch of Pertamina University who were selected randomly. This study uses primary data collected by distributing questionnaires to selected respondents. The data collected through the questionnaire is quantitative. This data includes information about the demographics of respondents and their perceptions of the variables studied. Furthermore, the data will be analyzed using IBM SPSS software version 26.

The data analysis includes testing the instrument through validity and reliability tests for each question. Then, the classical assumption test to check for errors in the regression model used in the study includes three steps, namely the normality test, the heteroscedasticity test, and the multicollinearity test. There is a multiple linear analysis test to measure how strong the linear relationship is between two or more variables and to determine the extent to which the independent variables affect the dependent variable [30]. Finally, the hypothesis test consists of a partial, simultaneous, and determination coefficient test.

Table 1. Operational Variables

Variables	Indicator	Measurement Scale
Incentives (X1)	- Bonus - Social security - Allowances	Likert Scale
Organizational Culture (X2)	- Awards - Values - Attitudes - Behavior - Identity - Differentiators	Likert Scale
Work Environment (X3)	- Employee relations - Noise levels - Work regulations - Lighting - Air circulation - Security	Likert Scale
Work Productivity (Y)	- Ability - Improved results - Work spirit - Self-development - Quality	Likert Scale

4. Results

4.1 Descriptive Analysis of Variables

Based on the results of the questionnaire distributed to 90 respondents of Pertamina University students of the 2021 intake with a total percentage of 100%, the majority of respondents were female at 65.6%, while males were 34.4%. Regarding age, the 21-year-old group dominated with a percentage of 70%, followed by 22-year-olds at 22.2%, 20-year-olds at 4.5%, and 23-year-olds at 3.3%. In addition, regarding the length of the internship, 45.6% of respondents underwent an internship for one month, 31.1% for two months, 10% for three months, and 13.3% for more than three months. The majority of respondents, namely 54.4%, did not receive pocket money during their internship, while the other 45.6% received pocket money from their place of work.

Table 2. Respondent Profile

No	Description	Frequency	Percentage
1	Gender		
	Male	31	34,4%
	Female	59	65,6%
2	Age		
	20 Years	4	4,5%
	21 Years	63	70%
	22 Years	20	22,2%
	23 Years	3	3,3%
3	Internship Period		
	1Month	41	45,6%
	2 Months	28	31,1%
	3 Months	9	10%
	> 3 Months	12	13,3%
4	Get Pocket Money		
	Yes	41	45,6%
	No	49	54,4%

4.2 Validity Test

Using the product moment correlation technique, the researcher declared all statements in this study valid based on the validity test results. In the incentive variables (X1), organizational culture (X2), work environment (X3), and work productivity (Y), the r-count value for each question item is greater than the r-table value of 0.207, so that all instruments are worthy of being given to respondents. Thus, the researcher can use all the questions in this research questionnaire to measure the relationship between variables in the study.

Table 3. Validity Test

Items	r count	r table	Conclusion	Items	r count	r table	Conclusion
Incentive (X1)				Work Environment (X3)			
X1.1	0,737	0,207	Valid	X3.1	0,602	0,207	Valid
X1.2	0,738	0,207	Valid	X3.2	0,548	0,207	Valid
X1.3	0,802	0,207	Valid	X3.3	0,781	0,207	Valid
X1.4	0,797	0,207	Valid	X3.4	0,805	0,207	Valid
X1.5	0,774	0,207	Valid	X3.5	0,610	0,207	Valid
X1.6	0,797	0,207	Valid	X3.6	0,801	0,207	Valid
X1.7	0,735	0,207	Valid	X3.7	0,449	0,207	Valid
X1.8	0,719	0,207	Valid	X3.8	0,832	0,207	Valid
X1.9	0,743	0,207	Valid	X3.9	0,751	0,207	Valid
X1.10	0,709	0,207	Valid	X3.10	0,800	0,207	Valid
Organizational Culture (X2)				Work Productivity (Y)			
X2.1	0,622	0,207	Valid	Y.1	0,810	0,207	Valid
X2.2	0,713	0,207	Valid	Y.2	0,856	0,207	Valid
X2.3	0,673	0,207	Valid	Y.3	0,884	0,207	Valid
X2.4	0,787	0,207	Valid	Y.4	0,817	0,207	Valid
X2.5	0,703	0,207	Valid	Y.5	0,845	0,207	Valid
X2.6	0,751	0,207	Valid	Y.6	0,823	0,207	Valid
X2.7	0,726	0,207	Valid	Y.7	0,649	0,207	Valid
X2.8	0,795	0,207	Valid	Y.8	0,824	0,207	Valid
X2.9	0,713	0,207	Valid	Y.9	0,834	0,207	Valid
X2.10	0,692	0,207	Valid	Y.10	0,725	0,207	Valid

4.3 Reability Test

Reliability testing ensures that the research instrument is consistent, stable, and reliable. The researcher assesses reliability using Cronbach's alpha value, considering the variable trustworthy if the value is more significant than 0.60. The results of the reliability test show that all variables in this study have a high level of consistency. The researcher found that Cronbach's alpha values for the incentive variables (0.916), organizational culture (0.893), work environment (0.865), and work productivity (0.939) all exceeded the minimum limit of 0.60. Therefore, the researcher concluded that this instrument is reliable and can be trusted to measure the studied variables.

Table 4. Reliability Test

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Conclusion
Incentives	0,916	Reliable
Organizational Culture	0,893	Reliable
Work Environment	0,865	Reliable
Work Productivity	0,939	Reliable

4.4 Normality Test

The normality test aims to evaluate whether the residual values in the research data have a normal distribution. The method often used to test normality is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Data is considered generally distributed if the residual value is more than 0.05. The test results show that the significance value (2-tailed) is 0.200, more significant than 0.05. The data from the questionnaire shows a normal distribution, as concluded by the researcher.

Table 5. Normality Test

	Kolmogorov – Smirnov		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Unstandardized Residual	0,071	90	0,200

4.5 Multicollinearity Test

The researcher uses the multicollinearity test to evaluate whether there is a substantial or significant relationship between the independent variables in the study, namely incentives (X1), organizational culture (X2), and work environment (X3). The analysis used each variable's variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance values. If the VIF value is less than 10 or the tolerance is more than 0.1, then the variable does not experience multicollinearity.

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test

Variables	Colleniarity Statistic		Information
	Tolerance	VIF	
Incentives	0,131	7,612	There is no multicollinearity
Organizational Culture	0,213	4,700	There is no multicollinearity
Work Environment	0,307	3,257	There is no multicollinearity

Table 6 above shows that the tolerance value for the incentive variables (X1), organizational culture (X2), and work environment (X3) is more significant than 0.1, while the VIF value is less than 10. Based on these results, this research model is free from multicollinearity, meaning there is no high correlation between the independent variables.

4.6 Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test aims to identify whether there are differences in residual variance in each observation, with the expectation that the research model has a constant residual variance. The test criteria are if the significance value for all independent variables is more significant than 0.05, then the model does not experience heteroscedasticity problems. The table shows that the significance value for the incentive variable (X1), organizational culture (X2), and work environment (X3) is more significant than 0.05, so the researcher concludes that there is no heteroscedasticity in this research model.

Table 7. Heteroscedasticity Test

Variables	Sig. Value (2 tailed)	Information
Incentives	0,676	There is no heteroscedasticity
Organizational Culture	0,056	There is no heteroscedasticity
Work Environment	0,086	There is no heteroscedasticity

4.7 T-Test (Partial Test)

The researcher conducts a partial test to determine whether the independent variable affects the dependent variable. The researcher makes the T-test decision if the calculated t value is greater than the t table or if the obtained significance value is less than 0.05, indicating that the independent variable significantly affects the dependent variable.

Table 8. Partial Test

Coefficient	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	5,480	3,005		1,824	0,072
Incentives	0,022	0,190	0,018	0,113	0,910
Organizational Culture	0,437	0,131	0,425	3,342	0,001
Work Environment	0,445	0,102	0,464	4,383	0,000

The following is an explanation of the statistical test results in the table above:

1. The t-test results show that the incentive variable has a significance value of 0.910 > 0.05, and the calculated t value is smaller than the t table, which is 0.113 < 1.987. The researcher concludes that the incentive variable does not partially affect the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students, so they reject the hypothesis.
2. The significance of t for the organizational culture variable is 0.001 < 0.05, and the calculated t value is 3.342 > 1.987. The researcher concludes that the organizational culture variable partially affects the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students and accepts the hypothesis.

3. The work environment variable has a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$ and a calculated t value of $4.383 > 1.987$. The researcher concludes that the work environment variable partially affects the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students and accepts the hypothesis.

4.8 F Test (Simultaneous Test)

The researcher uses a simultaneous test to determine whether all independent variables affect the dependent variable simultaneously. The researcher makes the F-test decision if the calculated F value is greater than the F table or if the significance is less than 0.05, indicating that the independent variables simultaneously affect the dependent variable.

Table 9. Simultaneous Test

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2141,908	3	713,969	67,978	0,000
Residual	903,248	86	10,503		
Total	3045,156	89			

The results of the F test above show that the calculated F value is greater than the F table, which is $67.978 > 2.71$, and the significance value is $0.000 < 0.05$. Thus, the variables of incentives, organizational culture, and work environment significantly affect the work productivity of students of the Pertamina University internship, and the hypothesis is accepted.

4.9 Test of Determination Coefficient (R-Squared)

The coefficient of determination (R^2) measures how much influence the independent variable has on the dependent variable. The goal is to assess how much the research model can explain the dependent variable. If the coefficient of determination (R^2) value is close to 1, the variables in this study can provide good information to predict the dependent variable.

Table 10. Determination Coefficient Test

R	R Squares	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
0,839	0,703	0,693	3,24081

The determination coefficient test shows an Adjusted R Square value of 0.693 or 69.3%, indicating that the incentive, organizational culture, and work environment variables can explain 69.3% of the variation in work productivity. Factors outside this research model affect the remaining 30.7%.

4.10 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis determines the relationship between the study's independent and dependent variables. This model uses three independent variables, namely incentives (X1), organizational culture (X2), and work environment (X3).

Table 11. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Coefficient	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient
	B	Std. Error	Beta
Constant	5,480	3,005	
Incentives	0,022	0,190	0,018
Organizational Culture	0,437	0,131	0,425
Work Environment	0,445	0,102	0,464

The researcher can prepare a multiple linear regression equation model based on the table above as follows:

$$Y = 5,480 + 0,022 X_1 + 0,437 X_2 + 0,445 X_3$$

The explanation of the regression equation above is:

1. A positive constant value of 5.480 indicates that if all independent variables (incentives, organizational culture, and work environment) are zero or fixed, the work productivity value is 5.480.
2. The incentive coefficient (X1) of 0.022 is positive; this indicates that every 1 unit increase in incentives (X1) will increase work productivity (Y) by 0.022.
3. The positive organizational culture coefficient (X2) of 0.437 indicates that every 1 unit increase in organizational culture (X2) will increase work productivity (Y) by 0.437.
4. The work environment coefficient (X3) has a positive value of 0.445, meaning that for every 1-unit increase in the work environment, work productivity (Y) will increase by 0.445.

5. Discussion

1. The Effect of Incentives on Work Productivity (H1)

The t-test results in Table 4.18 using SPSS software version 26.0 show that the calculated t-value for the incentive variable is 0.113, which is smaller than the t-table value of 1.987. In addition, the significance value of t is 0.910, more significant than 0.05. The researcher concludes that the incentive variable does not partially affect the work productivity of Pertamina University intern students, leading to the rejection of the hypothesis for this variable.

The results of this study indicate that students who undergo internship programs do not consider incentives as one of the factors that can increase their work productivity during the internship program. The study's results align with previous research conducted by Maliah & Kurniawan [31], which showed that incentive variables do not significantly affect employee productivity at PT. Tirta Bumi Raya Palembang.

2. The Influence of Organizational Culture on Work Productivity (H2)

Based on the t-test results in Table 4.18 with the SPSS tool, the organizational culture variable has a calculated t value of 3.342, more significant than the t table (1.987) and a significance t value of $0.001 < 0.05$. The researcher concludes that the organizational culture variable significantly affects the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students and accepts the hypothesis.

Internship students tend to have higher productivity when undergoing the program if the organizational culture implemented by the company supports it, both in terms of rules and relationships built between workers. These results also align with previous research conducted by Indrawati and Sembiring [32], which shows that organizational culture significantly affects employee productivity in the regional government.

3. The Influence of the Work Environment on Work Productivity (H3)

The t-test results in Table 4.18 using the SPSS tool show that the calculated t value for the work environment variable is 4.383, more significant than the t table (1.987), and the significance value of t is $0.000 < 0.05$. The researcher concludes that the work environment variable significantly affects the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students and accepts the hypothesis.

A conducive work environment increases student productivity during the internship program. Work environment support such as adequate facilities, good working relationships, and a comfortable atmosphere positively contribute to students' ability to complete their tasks more efficiently and effectively. The study results align with previous research conducted by Irmawati, Aneta, and Rahman [33], which showed that the work environment significantly affects work productivity at PT Pelindo (Persero) Branch Area 4 Gorontalo.

4. The Influence of Incentives, Organizational Culture, and Work Environment on Work Productivity (H4)

The test results in Table 4.19 using the SPSS tool show that the calculated F value for the incentive, organizational culture, and work environment variables is 67.978, more significant than the F table value (2.71). The researcher concludes that the incentive, organizational culture, and work environment variables significantly affect Pertamina University interns' work productivity and accepts the hypothesis.

In addition, the results of the determination coefficient (R^2) show the Adjusted R Square value in this study of 0.693 or 69.3%, which means that incentives, organizational culture, and work environment have an influence of 69.3% on the work productivity of Pertamina University interns. Meanwhile, the remaining 30.7% is influenced by factors not included in this study.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

1. Based on the study's results, incentives do not significantly affect the work productivity of Pertamina University internship students of the 2021 batch. However, organizational culture and work environment positively impact student productivity. Simultaneously, the third variable, namely incentives, organizational culture, and work environment, affects student work productivity with a contribution of 69.3%. At the same time, other factors outside this study influence dependency.
2. The implications of this study indicate that companies need to pay attention to organizational culture and work environment factors in supporting student productivity during work practices. In addition, the researcher advises students to be more selective in choosing companies with a conducive work environment and organizational culture. The results of this study can also be a reference for companies in improving the work practice system to be more effective and meet the needs of students as prospective workers.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.S. and E.S.; methodology, A.S.; software, A.S.; validation, A.S., E.S.; formal analysis, A.S.; investigation, A.S.; resources, A.S.; data curation, A.S.; writing original draft preparation, A.S.; writing review and editing, A.S.; visualization, A.S.; supervision, E.S.; project administration, E.S.; funding acquisition, E.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. M Badan Pusat Statistik. (2024). Keadaan Ketenagakerjaan Indonesia Februari 2024.
2. Tarma. (2016). Corporate Vocational School: Strategi Antisipatif Menghadapi Pengangguran Lulusan SMK dalam Perspektif Bonus Demografi. *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen Pendidikan*, 1(1), 1-6.
3. Tilaar, HAR. (2022). *Perubahan Sosial dan Pendidikan*. Gramedia.
4. Sofia, E., Yuliati, L. N., Hartoyo, & Soehadi, A. W. (2022). The Perception of Intention in Selection of Higher Education (Study Case: Aperti BUMN). *ICONIC-RS 2022*, 409-427.
5. Wahyuningsih, Sri. (2018). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja. *Jurnal Warta*, (57).
6. Damastara, A., & Sitohang, S. (2020). Pengaruh Pelatihan, Lingkungan Kerja dan Kompetensi Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen*, 9(11), 1-15.
7. Bashori, B. (2018). Meningkatkan Aktivitas dan Hasil Belajar Siswa Kelas IX Pada Mata Pelajaran Sejarah Kebudayaan Islam (SKI) Melalui Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Time Token Arends Di Mts Yapita Tambusai Kabupaten Rokan Hulu. *Didaktik*, 53(9), 1689–1699.
8. Akila. (2017). Pengaruh Insentif dan Pengawasan Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pada CV. Vassel Palembang. *Jurnal Ecoment Global*, 2(2), 35-48.
9. Sudanang, E.A., & Priyanto, S.E. (2020). Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan di Horison Apartemen dan Kondotel Yogyakarta. *Kepariwisata: Jurnal Ilmiah*, 14(1), 31-36.

10. Fau, J.F., & Buulolo, P. (2023). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Pegawai di Kantor Samsat Kabupaten Nias Selatan. *Riset dan E-Jurnal Manajemen Informatika Komputer*, 7(1), 533-536.
11. Astuti, E. A. (2017). Pengaruh Upah dan Insentif Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan*, 2(1), 33-43.
12. Hariandja, M. T. E. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. PT. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
13. Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu. (2005). *Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia*. PT. Refika Aditama.
14. Lampa, D.A., Yantu, I., & Bokingo, A.H. (2021). Pengaruh Insentif Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan PT. PLN (Persero) ULP. Telaga Gorontalo. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 4(2), 145-149.
15. Noor, Taufiqurrahman. (2017). Pengaruh Mutasi, Promosi dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Kantor Kementerian Agama Kota Banjarbaru. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Bisnis*, 3(2), 279-288.
16. Susanto. (2007). *Leadpreneurship*. Erlangga.
17. Robbins, Coulter. (2018). *Management (14th ed.)*. Pearson
18. Robbins, S.P. (2002). *Organizational Behavior: Culture, Design, and Application*. Prentice Hall International Inc.
19. Mulyani, & Utami, Ermi. (2021). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Produktivitas Karyawan pada PT. *Berkat Anugrah Sejahtera di Samarinda*. *Borneo Student Research*, 2(2), 1254-1260.
20. Badrianto, Y., & Ekhsan, M. (2019). Effect Of Work Environment And Job Satisfaction On Employee Performance In Pt. Nesinak Industries. *In Management and Accounting*, 2.
21. Simanjuntak, J. P. (2003). *Produktivitas Kerja Pengertian dan Ruang Lingkupnya*. Prisma.
22. Ghoniyah, Nunung, & Masurip. (2011). Peningkatan Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Kepemimpinan, Lingkungan Kerja dan Komitmen. *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen*, 2(2), 118-129.
23. Syahputra, R., Podungge, R., & Bokingo, A.H. (2022). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Pegawai di Dinas Perumahan Rakyat dan Kawasan Permukiman Kota Gorontalo. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 4(3), 1-6.
24. Busro. (2018). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Pranamedia Group.
25. Ferusgel, A. (2018). Pengaruh Keselamatan Dan Kesehatan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Pekerja PT. X 2015. 3.
26. Fathussyaadah, E., & Ardiansyah, A. (2020). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Bagian Produksi Susu UHT PT. INDOLAKTO. *Jurnal Ekonomak*, 6(2), 1-15.
27. Sutrisno, E. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Kencana.
28. Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Bisnis: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D (Edisi pertama)*. Alfabeta.
29. Sugiyono. (2016). *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
30. Ghozali, I. (2011). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivarite dengan IBM SPSS 19*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.
31. Maliah & Kurniawan, D. (2020). Pengaruh Upah dan Insentif Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pada PT. Tirta Bumi Raya Palembang. *Jurnal Kompetitif*, 9(1), 109-125.

32. Indrawati, L., & Sembiring, E.E. (2021). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Pegawai di Pemerintah Daerah. *Indonesian Accounting Research Journal*, 2(1), 7-13.
33. Irmawati, Aneta, Y., & Rahman, E. (2023). Pengaruh Lingkungan Kerja dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Pada PT Pelindo (Persero) Region 4 Cabang Gorontalo. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 5(3), 911-915.